DECIPHERING THE CRITICAL APPARATUS OF THE UBS-GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

Zambolis Sawkmie

This article aims to help theological students (beginners) to understand the intricate critical apparatus as they read the critical edition of the Greek New Testament. We shall proceed with a brief explanation on how the critical editions came to be. The area of New Testament Textual criticism was left untouched as it is outside the scope of this article. Only the important information were included and that too just in brief. Towards the end, a sample of reading the variant as found in the critical apparatus with regards to 1 John 3:5 was undertaken.

1. The Printing machine and the Greek New Testament

In 1436 Johannes Gutenberg designed a new machine that opens new horizons in the production of printed text. This machine was put to commercial use in 1454.[1] The production of the Bible too was benefitted from this machine. The printing of the Bible in Latin and other languages preceded the printing of the Greek New Testament. The publication of Complutensian polyglot (volume 1 published on January 10, 1517, final volume published on July 10, 1517) marked the first milestone in the printing of the Greek New Testament. However, in terms of circulation, it was the Greek New Testament compiled and prepared by Desiderius Erasmus that took the first place. This was entitled *Novum Instrumentum Omne* and published on March 1, 1516. It had undergone through a series of revision and in 1633 published by Elzevir (publisher) it received a new status with the name **Textus Receptus** from the words that appeared in the preface, "*Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum: in quo nihil immutanum aut corruptum damus* [What you have here, then, is the text which is now universally recognized: we offer it free of alterations, and corruptions]."[2] These words draws the attention of many biblical scholars of the time to examine the Greek text carefully.

[1] Albert Kapr, *Johannes Gutenberg: The Man and His Invention* (Aldershot, England: Scolar Press, 1996), 81, 84, 198, 203, 214. See also Sue Vander Hook, *Johannes Gutenberg: Printing Press Innovator* (Minnesota: ABDO Publishing Company, 2010), 42-52, 75-78. Diana Childress, *Johannes Gutenberg and the Printing Press* (Minneapolis: Twenty-First Century Books, 2008), 58-59, 62-87. 89-95.

[2] Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes, (1987; second edition, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989), 3-6. See also David Alan Black, *New Testament Criticism: A Concise Guide* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 29-30. Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation: Past and Present* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 242-43, 253. Jack Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974), 55-59.

2. Emergence of New Testament Textual Criticism

It was found that Erasmus made use of the Greek New Testament manuscripts of the 12th or 13th century. Majority of these manuscripts represented the Byzantine Imperial text type or the Majority Text. Furthermore, Erasmus had inserted in Revelation 22:16-21 his own Greek translation from Latin because that particular text segment was missing from the Greek New Testament manuscripts he consulted.[3] With the publication of more polyglots with different Greek New Testament manuscripts, an issue of "uniform text" crept in. As a result, along with the discoveries of many Greek New Testament manuscripts the view of biblical scholars had changed with regards to the text of the Textus Receptus. It became clear that there have been a non-uniformity of the Greek New Testament manuscripts.[4] As of now there were more than 5600 Greek New Testament manuscripts that were identified and classified according to the material and writing styles.[5] The facsimile of these manuscripts can be accessed online.[6]

Since the original manuscript of the Greek New Testament is not extant, and what had been identified were copies of copies from the original. Each of them differs from another. The situation triggers the immediate need to trace the original text from the extant manuscripts. Thus, New Testament Textual criticism was initiated. Gordon D. Fee offered concise definition of Textual criticism:

> Textual criticism is the science that compares all known manuscripts of a given work in an effort to trace the history of variations within the text so as to discover its original form.[7]

The process of New Testament textual criticism and the principles that were employed are outside the scope of this short article.[8]

---

[3] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 4.

[4] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 6-10.

[5] http://csntm.org/videos/; See also Katie Leggett and Greg Paulson, "How many Greek New Testament Manuscripts Are There REALLY? The Latest Numbers", http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/intfblog/-/blogs/how-many-greek-new-testament-manuscripts-are-there-really-the-latest-numbers. David C. Parker, *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 33.

[6] https://manuscripts.csntm.org; Bart Ehrman Blog, "The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament", https://ehrmanblog.org/the-greek-manuscripts-of-the-new-testament/

[7] Gordon D. Fee, "Textual Criticism of the New Testament," *Studies in the Theory ad Method of New Testament Criticism*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, Studies and Documents, 45, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 3. [3-16].

[8] An idea of New Testament Textual Criticism can be learned from Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*; Eberhard W. Güting, *Textual Criticism and the New Testament Text: Theory, Practice, and Editorial Technique* Text-Critical Studies, 12, (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2020); Jack Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974); and many other scholarly books.

3. Classification of Greek New Testament manuscripts

3.1. Materials:

Based on material, the New Testament manuscripts are classified as Papyri[9] and Parchment [untanned skins of animal primarily sheep, calves and goats] or vellum [a finer quality of parchment]; and Palimpsest [a writing material used one or more times after earlier writing has been erased].[10]

The abbreviation for papyri manuscripts that was used in the critical apparatus in the Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament is a gothic capital letter[11] 𝔓 with a superscript, example: $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$. In this article we shall use Latin capital letter P instead of gothic capital letter. The superscript Arabic numeral that appeared immediately after P refers to the sequence of their discovery and will never meant the manuscript date.

3.2. Writing Styles:

Based on handwriting styles, New Testament texts were classified as *majuscules* [a form of handwriting style which in appearance is similar to the capital letters in Latin scripts. Some scholars used the name *uncials* instead of *majuscules*. D. C. Parker[12] opined that the term *uncial* is not proper for Greek manuscript], and *minuscules* [a form of handwriting style which is similar to the small letters of handwritten Latin scripts. It was also known as *cursive*.] Vast majority of extant Greek New Testament manuscripts belongs to *minuscules*.[13]

The *majuscule manuscripts* are designated by Capital letters {Mostly Latin alphabets, there are a few designated with Hebrew or Greek alphabet} or an initial 0 (zero). Example: ℵ 01 refer to Codex Sinaiticus. This manuscript can be

---

[9] Bart D. Ehrman, Michael W. Holmes, "Preface," *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the "Status Quaestionis"*, eds. Bart D. Ehrman, Michael W. Holmes, (Gand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), x-xi. See also Eldon Jay Epp, "The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament," *The Text of the New Testament*, eds. Ehrman and Holmes, 3. Colin H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935). Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*, Fasciculus II, The Gospels and Acts (London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933).

[10] https://www.adelaide.edu.au/library/special/exhibitions/cover-to-cover/papyrus/ Detail explanation can be found in https://archieves.gov/preservation/formats/paper-vellum.html; https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/palimpsest

[11] The correct glyph is obtained using Unicode 1D513. See also Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce Metzger, (eds.), *The Greek New Testament*, Fifth Revised Edition, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2014), 9, 12-16. See Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 96-102 for a detail description of papyri manuscripts.

[12] D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 35, 53. Idem, "The Majuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament," *The Text of the New Testament*, eds. Ehrman and Holmes, 22.

[13] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 5.

identified either by א or 01. The same holds true for manuscript Θ 038. Other manuscripts may not have any capital letter, but only an Arabic numeral prefixed with a 0 (zero).[14]

The *minuscule manuscripts* are designated by simple Arabic numerals. Example: 1, 28, 2344.[15]

3.3. Text-Types

Text-type refers to textual cluster with distinctive textual characters different from other textual cluster on the basis of "full quantitative comparison of agreement / disagreement in variation units."[16] The text-types were categorized on the basis of the "percentage of agreement that manuscripts have with one another over a total area of variation;" and also on the "amount of agreement these manuscripts have in variant readings peculiar to them."[17]

Beginning with Johan Albrecht Bengel, Johann Salomo Semler, Johann Jacob Griesbach and many others textual critics, the Greek New Testament manuscripts were grouped into three major families of texts.[18]

3.3.1. Type-1

All Greek New Testament manuscripts that were found in Alexandria in Egypt comes under this text-type. For example the Gospel texts P^{75}, P^{66}, Pauline texts P^{46}; Peter and Jude texts P^{72}, Codex Sinaiticus (א01), Codex Vaticanus (B03), citations of Origen, and later Alexandrian fathers (Didymus, Athanasius, Cyril). Other manuscripts like Codex Ephraemi (C), Codex Regius (L), W, 33 comes closer to this text-type.[19] The date ascribed to this text-type is second century C.E.[20]

The composition style in this text-type exhibit the terse, rough, less harmonized and generally more difficult characteristic features as compared to other text-types. In most cases in textual evaluation, manuscripts having these characters are usually considered to be original.[21]

---

[14] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 9-10, 16-23. See Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 107-128 for a detail description of majuscule manuscripts.

[15] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 10, 23-25. See Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 129-138 for a detail description of minuscule manuscripts.

[16] Epp, "The Papyrus Manuscripts", 15-16.

[17] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 7.

[18] Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 61-65.

[19] Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, Fourth edition, (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 179.

[20] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 7.

[21] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 7. For detail see Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 50-71.

3.3.2. Type-2

The manuscripts in this group are commonly called "Western" not in the sense of the present day understanding. These manuscripts are those found in North Africa, Italy, and Southern France. Fee noticed that the variant readings found in the manuscripts of this text-type can be found in manuscripts in the East and in Alexandria too, and thus, "Western" was a misnomer for this text-type.[22]

The manuscripts in this text-type have unusual textual readings having long paraphrases and long additions. At times they "apparently reflecting an uncontrolled … tradition of copying and translating."[23] These characteristic features should not downgrade the status of this text-type. There are instances where scholars felt that this text-type preserved the original New Testament text.[24] Codex Bezae (D05), P29, P38, and a few others are important Western texts.[25]

3.3.3. Type-3

About eighty percent of all Greek New Testament manuscripts come under this text-type. This text-type is popularly known as the "Byzantine" or "Majority" text. It appeared specifically in the writings of "writers associated with the church of Antioch: The Cappadocians, Chrysostom, and Theodoret of Cyrus."[26] Codex Alexandrinus (A02) is an example of this text-type.

3.3.4. Type-4

This text-type was commonly called Caesarean. B. H. Streeter identified this text-type as "Family Theta (which includes the Koridethi codex [Θ] and the groups of minuscules known as family[27] 1 and family 13, and in Origen after he came to Caesarea in 231/232."[28] One of the characteristic features of this text-type is an admixture of *text-type-1* and *text-type-3*. Thus, the date of this text-type does not support of an earlier date than that of type-1 and type-2.[29]

4. Variant Readings

The above classification of the available Greek New Testament manuscripts had help the textual critics to be systematic in evaluating the variant readings. Peter

[22] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 7.
[23] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 7.
[24] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 7.
[25] H. Joseph Lalfakmawia, "Characteristics of Major Greek New Testament Critical Editions: Textus Receptus and Its Subsequent Editions," in *Indian Journal of Theology*, 65/2 (2023):6. [1-29]
[26] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 8. See also Epp, "The Papyrus Manuscripts", 17.
[27] See Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 11.
[28] Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 71.
[29] Eldon Jay Epp, *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 491. See also Lalfakmawia, "Characteristics of Major Greek New Testament," 6, 23.

J. Gurry[30] had done a good survey on the number of variants in the Greek New Testament.

Gurry brought into our attention the definition of the term *variant*. He noted the interchangeably usage of three different words – 'variant', 'reading', and 'difference'[31] – without any clear precision on the meaning. He acknowledged the fact that there has been a number of attempts to distinguish between the terms *variant* and *reading*, but a consensus has yet to emerge.[32] A definition of *textual variant* he proposed excludes the spelling differences and different ways of abbreviating *nomina sacra*.[33] A Textual Variant is defined as

> A word or concatenation of words in any manuscript that differs from any other manuscript within a comparable segment of text.[34]

Keeping in mind the principle of this definition, Gurry did a thorough research on a sample text of about three percent of the entire Greek New Testament including majuscules, minuscules, and lectionaries. As a result, he proposed a reasonable estimate for the number of textual variants in the Greek New Testament which is about 500,000.[35]

5. Other witnesses used in reconstructing the Greek text of the New Testament

5.1. Lectionaries

The lectionaries are the second largest group of manuscripts of the New Testament.[36] The text contained therein do not follow the regular canonical sequence. Initially they were not considered important in the quest for the original text of the Greek New Testament. Later on, they were counted as important witness specifically in "tracing the history of transmission of the text of the New Testament."[37] They were group in two ways: (1) by their contents; and (2) by their type of sequence.[38]

---

[30] Peter J. Gurry, "The Number of Variants in the Greek New Testament: A Proposed Estimate," in *New Testament Studies* 62/1 (January 2016): 97-121.

[31] Gurry, "The Number of Variants," 103.

[32] Gurry, "The Number of Variants," 103.

[33] Gurry, "The Number of Variants," 103.

[34] Gurry, "The Number of Variants," 103.

[35] Gurry, "The Number of Variants," 108, (The tables of variants are found in pages 106–8.).

[36] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 5

[37] Carroll D. Osburn, "The Greek Lectionaries of the New Testament," in *The Text of the New Testament*, eds. Ehrman and Holmes, 61.

[38] Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts*, 35-36.

The lectionaries were designated by a prefix *l* followed by an Arabic numeral. Example: *l* 59; *l* 1590.[39]

5.2. Early Versions

The early versions of the New Testament played a vital role as the important witnesses for the Greek New Testament. The early versions are in Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Gothic, Armenian, Georgian, Ethiopic, Slavonic and Arabic. "They are cited only in instances where their underlying Greek text may be determined with certainty or with a high degree of probability."[40] Their importance is also counted in "the attempt to trace the history of textual transmission and corruption."[41]

They were designated by small Latin letters for the language version with superscript for the individual manuscripts. Example: it^{a}; it^{comp} for the Old Latin Version;[42] vg, vg^{cl}, vg^{st} for the Vulgate;[43] syr^{s}; syr^{ph} for Syriac;[44] cop^{sa}; cop^{bo} for Coptic.[45]

5.3. Patristic Citations

The writings of the church fathers was taken into account as tertiary evidence in New Testament textual criticism. The importance lies in their citations of the Greek text. They are essential specially in locating the variant readings *geographically* and *chronologically*.[46]

6. Brief overview on the development of the critical edition of the Greek New Testament

6.1. Karl Lackmann

It was in 1831 that the first Greek New Testament based on Textual Criticism principles was published by Karl Lackmann. He understood that it would not be possible to establish the original text of the Greek New Testament. So he focused

---

[39] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 26-29. See also Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 171 for a recently discovered lectionaries.

[40] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 30.

[41] Fee, "Textual Criticism", 5-6.

[42] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 30-33.

[43] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 33.

[44] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 33-34.

[45] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 34.

[46] M. J. Suggs, "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text" in *New Testament Studies*, 4/2 (January 1958):139. [139-47]. See also Fee, "Textual Criticism", 6. Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 36-43. Bruce M. Metzger, "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," in *New Testament Studies*, 18/4 (July 1972):379-400. Carroll D. Osborn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism," in *Novum Testamentum*, 47/4 (2005):313-343.

"to present the oldest attainable text, that is, the text that was in use in the fourth century when the oldest majuscule were copied."[47]

6.2. Constantine Tischendorf

Constantine Tischendorf published a critical edition of the Greek New Testament. The eight edition was published during 1869-1872. His principle in assessing the manuscripts is based on its age and character of the text. His publication contained a massive critical apparatus in which he "present compactly a very large number of variant readings from the manuscripts, the versions, and the church fathers."[48]

He discovered the Codex Sinaiticus (א) and its influence seems to predominate his eight edition of his Greek New Testament.[49]

6.3. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort

In 1881 Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort published the Greek New Testament titled *The New Testament in the Original Greek*.[50] It has two volumes: Volume 1 contained the Greek Text and Volume 2 contained the statement of the principles followed by them. It also contained notes on certain readings. They utilized the genealogical method in an attempt to recover the text of an earlier common textual ancestor.[51] They distinguished four types of texts: (1) The Syrian text, "represented by Codex Alexandrinus, the later majuscule manuscripts and the great mass of minuscule manuscripts. The Textus Receptus is the latest form of the Syrian text."[52] (2) The Western type, represented by Codex Bezae (D), Codex Claromontanus (D^P).[53] (3) The Alexandrian Text, represented by Codex Ephraemi (c), Codex Regius (L), Codex 33, and the Coptic versions especially cop^{bo}.[54] (4) the Neutral text, represented by Codex Vaticanus (B) and Codex Sinaiticus (א).[55]

The analysis of Westcott and Hort clearly demonstrated that "the Syrian (or Byzantine) text is later than the other types of text."[56] This finding is like a fatal blow to the status of Textus Receptus. As a result of which, scholars were in consensus to recognize that Westcott and Hort's critical edition of the Greek New

[47] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 5th edition, 11. See also Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 62-63.
[48] Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 63-64.
[49] Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 63.
[50] Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 175.
[51] Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 64.
[52] Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 177.
[53] Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 178.
[54] Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 179.
[55] Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 179.
[56] Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 180-1.

Testament was epoch-making. The text produced was "doubtless the oldest and purest that could be attained on the basis of information available in their day."[57]

6.4. Bernhard Weiss

Bernhard Weiss published a Greek New Testament in three volumes in 1894-1900. In the process of editing, he adopted "the variants he regarded as most appropriate to the author's style and theology, and mark into different groups the kinds of errors he identified. In assessing the manuscripts, Weiss concluded that the Codex Vaticanus was the best. Thus, in line with Westcott and Hort, Weiss's edition of the Greek New Testament is closer to Codex Vaticanus.[58]

6.5. Richard Francis Weymouth

Besides the above mentioned work on the production of the critical edition of the Greek New Testament, there were many other critical editions published in succeeding years. Their presence and availability to scholars draws the attention of Richard Francis Weymouth who wants to compare them with an intention to "prepare a Greek New Testament that would exhibit such consensus as was found in them."[59] In 1886 he published his work titled *The Resultant Greek Testament*.

6.6. Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, Kurt Aland

In 1898 Eberhard Nestle published a Greek New Testament based upon a comparison of just three editions: those of Tischendorf (the 8th edition); Wescott and Hort, and Weymouth. From the third edition, Nestle replaced the text of Weymouth with that of Bernhard Weiss. Since Westcott and Hort, and Weiss gave preference to Codex Vaticanus (B) and Tischendorf to Codex Sinaiticus (א), ***the Nestle text is closer to Codex Vaticanus (B)***. Nestle provide a critical apparatus that listed the variants readings from other manuscripts. He included also the notes proposed for changing the text.[60]

Erwin Nestle, the son of Eberhard Nestle continued this work and in 1952 he was joined by Kurt Aland. Together they published the 25th edition in 1963 with the same name and an additional header in the cover-page having the name Nestle-Aland. Because of this it was popularly known as Nestle-Aland text.

---

[57] Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 183.

[58] Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 184. See also Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 66.

[59] Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 66-67.

[60] Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, See also Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th Revised Edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaff, 2012), 46.

6.7. United Bible Societies

In 1966 the American Bible Society in New York, the British and Foreign Bible Society in London, the National Bible Society of Scotland in Edinburgh, the Netherlands Bible Society in Amsterdam and the Württemberg Bible Society in Stuttgart simultaneously published *The Greek New Testament*. This was edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Bruch M. Metzger and Allen Wikgren. This edition was specifically "intended as a basis for the work of Bible translators throughout the world, and the variant readings shown in the critical apparatus are chiefly those where translation will be affected by the reading chosen."[61]

The text was established in line of Westcott and Hort but differed considerably from Nestle's 25th edition.[62] When the third edition was prepared, Kurt Aland was included in the editorial team. His involvement with the editorial work of the Nestle's text in preparation for the 26th edition, let him to contribute constructively to the editorial team of the third edition of *The Greek New Testament*. As a result of which, it was strongly felt that both *Novum Testamentum Graece* and *The Greek New Testament* will have an identical text. This was materialized when the 26th edition of *Novum Testamentum Graece* and the third edition of *The Greek New Testament* have the same text.[63] The only difference between these two is found in the number of variant readings in their critical apparatuses. Since *The Greek New Testament* is primarily intended for translators, the text critical apparatus contained only those variants that are relevant for translation. The evidence for those passages that contained variants is displayed as complete as possible. Whereas the *Novum Testamentum Graece* is intended mainly for research, academic education and pastoral practice, the critical apparatus contains more information to enable "the reader to make critical assessment of the reconstruction of the Greek initial text."[64]

---

[61] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition, x. Aland, Karavidopoulos, et. al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 47.

[62] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition, x-xi. Aland, Karavidopoulos, et. al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 47.

[63] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition, xiii. Aland, Karavidopoulos, et. al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 47.

[64] Aland, Karavidopoulos, et. al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 47. The detail explanation of critical apparatus of *The Greek New Testament* can be found in the introduction, pages 1-63. With regards to the evaluation of the evidence for the text, read pages 8-9 in the Introduction. Furthermore, see also Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on The Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to The United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*, (New York: United Bible Societies, First edition, 1971; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Second edition, 1994). The detail explanation of critical apparatus of *Novum Testamentum Graece* can be found in the Introduction, pages 46-88.

7. A Practical reading of the variant reading from *The Greek New Testament*

7.1. Sample Text from The Greek New Testament:

1 John 3:5 καὶ οἴδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας[2] ἄρῃ, καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν.

[Translation: *And you have known that he was made visible, in order that he may take away the sins, and in him there is no sin.*[65]]

7.2. Critical Apparatus:

7.2.1. 2nd Edition:

[2] **5** {C} ἁμαρτίας A B P 33 436 945 1241 1739 1881 it$^{ar, c, dem, div, h, p, z}$ syr^{h} cop^{bo} arm eth Tertulian (Augustine) Fulgentius // ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ℵ C K Ψ 049 056 0142 81 88 104 181 326 330 451 614 630 1505 1877 2127 2412 2492 2495 *Byz Lect* vg syr^{p} cop$^{sa, fay}$ Athanasius Ps-Oecumenius Theophylact // ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου 629

7.2.2. 3rd Edition:

[2] **5** {C} ἁμαρτίας A B P 33 436 945 1241 1739 1881 it$^{ar, c, dem, div, h, p, z}$ syr^{h} cop^{bo} arm eth Tertulian (Augustine) Fulgentius // ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ℵ C K L Ψ 049 056 0142 81 88 104 181 326 330 451 614 630 1505 1877 2127 2412 2492 2495 *Byz Lect* vg syr^{p} cop$^{sa, fay}$ Athanasius Ps-Oecumenius Theophylact // ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου 629

7.2.3. 4th Edition:

[2] 5 {A} ἁμαρτίας A B P 33 322 323 436 945 1067 1241 1243 1409 1735 1739 1852 1881 2344 2464 it$^{ar, l, z}$ vgst syr^{h} cop$^{sa mss, bo}$ arm eth Tertullian Augustine // ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ℵ C Ψ 81 1175 1292 1505 1611 1844 2138 2298 *Byz* [K L] *Lect* vg$^{cl, ww}$ syr^{p} cop$^{sa mss, fay}$ geo slav Athanasius // ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου 629 vg^{mss}

7.2.4. 5th Edition:

[2] 5 {A} ἁμαρτίας A B P 5 33 436 1243 1409 1735 1739 1852 1881 2344 it$^{ar, l, z}$ vgst syr^{h} cop^{bo} arm eth Tertullian Augustine // ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ℵ C Ψ 81 307 442 642 1175 1448 1611 2492 *Byz* [K L] *Lect* vg$^{cl, ww}$ syr^{p} cop$^{sa, fay, v}$ geo slav Athanasius BTI

[65] Translated by Zambolis Sawkmie.

7.3 Reading the Critical Apparatus:

In the second and third editions of *The Greek New Testament*, the word ἁμαρτίας appeared in the main biblical text. In the critical apparatus, we observed that this word has been rated C, which means that the committee of textual scholars who prepare these editions had "difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text."[66]

Whereas in the fourth and fifth editions of *The Greek New Testament*, the word ἁμαρτίας has been rated A, which means that the committee of textual scholars felt the certainty of this word.

However, there has been no clear explanation as to how the shift in rating {from **C** to **A**} was decided.

The witness to the accepted reading are:

7.3.1. Manuscripts witness:

The list of ***majuscule manuscripts*** that support this reading are: A of the V century; B of the IV century, P of the VI century.[67]

The list of ***minuscule manuscripts*** that support this reading are: 33 of the IX century; **322** of the XV century; **323** of the XI century; 436 of the XI century; 945 of the XI century; **1067** of the XIV century; 1241 of the XII century; **1243** of the XI century; **1409** of the XIV century; **1735** of the XI / XII century; 1739 of the X century; **1852** of the XIII century; 1881 of the XIV century; **2344** of the XI century; **2464** of the IX century.[68] These manuscripts in bold letters are used in the fourth edition.

In the fifth edition, one ***new minuscule manuscripts*** is added: 5 of the XIV century. It was found that quite a number of the ***minuscule manuscripts were removed*** from the list: 945, 1067, 1241, and 2464. There has been no clear reason provided as to their removal from the list.

7.3.2. Versions witness:

The second and third editions contained the same list of Versions witnesses: it^{ar} the Old Latin version of the IX century, it^{c} of the XII / XIII century; it^{dem} of the XIII century; it^{div} of the XII century; it^{h} of the V century; it^{p} of the VIII century; it^{z} of the VIII century; syr^{h} the Syriac version of AD 615/616; cop^{bo} the Coptic

[66] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 8.
[67] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 16-17.
[68] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 129-137.

(Bohairic) version from the third century; arm the Armenian version from the fifth century; eth the Ethiopic version from about 500.[69]

The fourth and fifth edition add one new Old Latin version as witness: it^{l} of the VIII century. They removed from the list those Old Latin version that are after the IX century. But there was no explanation of the removal of it^{p} of the VIII century from the list.[70]

The fourth edition add a new Coptic version witness: $cop^{sa^{mss}}$ a Coptic (Sahidic) version from the third century. However, the double superscript with abbreviation mss indicates that the text though early but was not reliable. In the fifth edition, this Coptic version was removed from the list.[71]

7.3.3. Patristic witnesses:

The second and fourth edition listed three church fathers: Tertullian who is a Latin Church father after 220. Augustine who is a Latin Church father 430. His name was placed under parentheses, which means that "a citation supports the reading for which it is cited, but deviates from it in minor details." Fulgentius who is a Latin Church father of 533.[72]

In the fourth and fifth editions, the parentheses from the name of Augustine was removed, so also the name of Fulgentius.

7.4. Variant 1:

Instead of ἁμαρτίας it has ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν [translation: *our sin*] supported by these witnesses:

7.4.1. Majuscules:

א codex Sinaiticus of the IV century; C codex Ephraemi of the V century; K of the IX century; Ψ of the IX / X century; 049 of the IX century ~ It is strange that this manuscript was included as witness when it has only the Acts and Pauline letters; 056 of the X century ~ this manuscript has only the Acts and Pauline letters; 0142 of the X century ~ this manuscript has only the Acts and Pauline letters.[73]

In the fourth and fifth edition the majuscule witnesses 049; 056 and 0142 has been removed.

---

[69] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 31-36.
[70] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 32.
[71] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 34, 36.
[72] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 41-43.
[73] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition, xvii-xviii.

7.4.2. Minuscules:

81 of 1044; 88 of XII century; 104 of of 1087 ~ this manuscript has only the Pauline letters; 181 of the X century ~ this manuscript has only the book of Acts; 326 of the XII century ~ this manuscript has only the book of Acts and Pauline letters; 330 of the XII century ~ this manuscript has only the Gospels, the book of Acts and Pauline epistles; 451 of the IX century ~ this manuscript has only the book of Acts and Pauline letters; 614 of the XIII ~ this manuscript has only the book of Acts and the Pauline letters; 630 of the XIV century ~ this manuscript has only the book of Acts and the Pauline letters; 1505 of 1084 ~ this manuscript has only the Gospels, the book of Acts, and Pauline letters; 1877 of the XIV century ~ this manuscript has only the book of Acts and Pauline letters; 2127 of the XII century ~ this manuscript has only the Gospels, the book of Acts and the Pauline letters; 2412 of the XII century ~ this manuscript has only the book of Acts and the Pauline letters; 2492 of the XIII century ~ this manuscript has only the Gospels, the book of Acts and the Pauline letters; 2495 of the XIV / XV century ~ this manuscript has only the Gospels, the book of Acts, Pauline letters and Revelation; *Byz* the reading of the majority of Byzantine manuscripts.[74]

Fourth edition added these manuscripts: Majuscules with a Byzantine text: [**K** of the V century; **L** of the IX century]; Minuscules: **1175** of the X century; **1292** of XIII century; **1611** of the XII century; **1844** of the XV century; **2138** of 1072; **2298** of the XI century. It removed all those manuscripts that does not have the Catholic epistles.[75]

The Fifth Edition remove a few manuscripts from the fourth edition: 1292 1844 2138 and 2298. However it adds new manuscripts: **307** of the X century; **442** of the XII / XIII century; **642** of the XIV century; **1448** of the XII century; **2492** of the XIV century.

7.4.3. Lectionaries:

Lect ~ the majority of the selected lectionaries together with the lectionary of the Greek Church.[76]

[74] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition, xix-xx.

[75] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 134-137. See also Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 16-17, 23-25.

[76] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 27, 29.

7.4.4. Versions:

vg ~ a Vulgate of the Fourth / Fifth Century; syr^{p} a Syriac version Peshitta of the first half of fifth century; cop^{sa} a Coptic (Sahidic) version from the third century; cop^{fay} a Coptic (Fayyumic) version from the third century.[77]

The fourth edition added these Versions: vg^{cl} Vulgate (Clementine) of the fourth / fifth century; vg^{ww} a Vulgate (Wordsworth-White) of the fourth / fifth century; cop^{sa}^{mss} a Coptic (Sahidic) version from the third century. However, the double superscript with abbreviation mss indicates that the text though early but was not reliable. Geo a Georgian from the fifth century; slav an Old Church Slavonic from the ninth century. [78]

The fifth edition added one new Versions to the list of the fourth edition: cop^{v} a Coptic (Dialect V) from the third century.[79]

7.4.5. Patristic Evidences:

The second and third editions have three patristic evidence: Athanasius who is a Greek Church Father of 373; Ps-Oecumenius who is a Greek Church Father of the VI century; Theophylact of 1077.[80] The fourth and fifth editions retained only Athanasius and removed Ps-Oecumenius and Theophylact.

7.5. Variant 2

The reading ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου [translation: *sin of the world*] instead of ἁμαρτίας. It was supported by only one minuscule manuscript as mentioned in the second and third editions. 629 of the XIV century. The fourth edition add a Version as witness to this reading: vg^{mss} a Vulgate from the fourth / fifth century. However, the double superscript with abbreviation mss indicates that the text though early but was not reliable.[81]

This variant reading was omitted in the fifth edition.

7.6. Comments on the variant readings:

The reading adapted in the text has been considered to be certain. The editorial committee identified this certainty with the capital letter A within braces. This has the support of many manuscript witnesses ranging from the IV century to 553 in the citation of the Church Fathers. The meaning as appeared in the text is implicit as it leaves gap for readers to fill in. ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ ~ *in order that he may*

[77] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 33-35.
[78] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 33-35.
[79] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 35.
[80] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition, xxxix-xl.
[81] Aland, et.al., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, 33, 35.

take away the sins. The word ἁμαρτίας in this context leaves open for interpretation – it may mean the sins of people or our sins, it may also mean the sins of the world in the same line with Johannine literature.

The Variant reading 1 that reads ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ ~ *in order that he may take away our sins*. This has got the support of many witnesses ranging from the IV century to 1077. This had made the meaning explicit by the addition of the word ἡμῶν. However, the meaning still is implicit depending upon the readers. It may either refer to the sins of all people or to the sins of those who hear the Gospel. It cannot be taken for granted that all reader in any context will have the same understanding as the believers. From the perspective of the church, this would have been the appropriate reading. But on the basis of textual criticism principles the shorter reading was preferred, and thus the reading remained as it is in the text.

The Variant reading 2 that reads ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου ἄρῃ ~ *in order that he may take away the sins of the world*. This reading is more refined and is in line with Johannine thought. However, the witness to this variant is meagre and cannot have enough support to contest with the other variants. That is the reason why it was left unknown in the fifth edition.

Based on the above analysis of the variants in this specific text as appeared in different editions of *The Greek New Testament*, it is clear that the editorial committee did not strictly keep one of its purposes that stated: "A full citation of representative evidence for each variant selected." More so, there has not been any clear explanation on the changes made in the selection and rejection of witnesses, other than those witnesses that does not have the reading on the selected variant.

Conclusion:

We have attempted in a nutshell to take the students through the complexity of the critical apparatus. The sample reading though complex at the surface level because the variants were being looked at from the critical apparatus as appeared in the second, third, fourth, and fifth edition of *The Greek New Testament*. This is just to enhance our understanding of the difficulty faced by the committee of the critical text edition in coming to terms that will produce a good text of *The Greek New Testament*.